



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and that therefore as late as in his age the Christian canon was not yet established. Our author, the Rev. Hermann Kutter, proposes to re-establish the old view that the canon was established at that time, because Clement, after all, distinguishes between reliable Christian writings and those which he uses only to refute heretical doctrines. Our author grants that Clement did not as yet know a canon in the sense in which the term is at present accepted, but he shows a discrimination as to the value of his sources, and relies on them as an authority only if they belong to what he calls "the Lord's writings" (*γραφαὶ κυριακαί*).

It is difficult to say whether the defence of the old position is better or worse than the view of the critics so called, for the Rev. Mr. Kutter takes pains to explain the carelessness of Clement, his lack of criticism, and his confusion (*Zerfahrenheit*). Clement in quoting passages, is in the habit of "volatilising their sense whenever it suits him" (*wenn es ihm gerade passt*). Under these circumstances, the Rev. Mr. Kutter argues, judging from the character of his writings, Clement may have expressed himself without precision and yet have adhered to a definite ideal of true Christianity. He quoted "the gospel of the Egyptians" only through the imputation of heretics, and had probably not read it himself. This is quite probable, but we may just as well say that a definite conception of Christianity became established and thus paved the way for a final settlement of the canon.

One of the chief merits of Clement, according to Mr. Kutter, is that to him the revelation was closed. The Old and the New Testament had found their perfection in the past, and he recognises the difference between his own time and the Apostolic age.

Thus, while he relies on tradition, and does not mean to separate tradition from Scripture, God's salvation is to him a fact which has been completed in the past.

κρς.

DIE MODERNE PHYSIOLOGISCHE PSYCHOLOGIE IN DEUTSCHLAND. Eine historisch-kritische Untersuchung mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Problems der Aufmerksamkeit. Von *W. Heinrich*. Zweite Ausgabe. Zürich: E. Speidel. 1899. Pages, vii, 249. Price, M. 4.

ZUR PRINZIPIENFRAGE DER PSYCHOLOGIE. Von *W. Heinrich*. Zürich: E. Speidel. 1899. Pages, 74. Price, M. 2.

Professor W. Heinrich, of the Physical Institute of Krakau, passes in review in the first of these pamphlets a number of psychological authors who have been or are still before the public, and whose views form the subject-matter of psychology to-day; such men as Fechner, Helmholtz, G. E. Müller, Wundt, Lange, Külpe, Münsterberg, Ziehen, Avenarius, and Exner. We are sorry not to find among them Prof. Ernst Mach, whose views deserve to be mentioned as much as those of any one of the above, and since Mach is a physicist like the author he should have been mentioned by Professor Heinrich. It goes without saying that being exclu-

sively under the influence of German philosophy, English and American psychologists are entirely neglected.

Professor Heinrich is critical and thoughtful, and his views upon the whole are sound. He takes the monistic standpoint and adopts the parallelism of psychic and physiological processes. In his second pamphlet, where he proposes to discuss the question of principle in psychology, he is most explicit in rejecting dualism in any form that might be understood as a causation in contradiction to physical causation. He says on page 17: "We cannot escape the conclusion of a perfect interdependence of the psychical and the physical which is not disturbed by the fact that on both sides of our synthesis heterogeneous elements appear whose elements offer qualitatively different results."

The world may not know that Krakau has a physical institute, and we are glad to receive a symptom of intellectual life so full of promise from these quarters of Europe, which have so far not as yet been mentioned in the history of psychology.

κρς.

BRAIN IN RELATION TO MIND. By *J. Sanderson Christison, M. D.* Chicago. 1899. Pages, 143. Price, \$1. 25.

Dr. Christison, who served as an expert in several sensational law suits before the bar of Chicago, and may be remembered by our readers as the author of *Crime and Criminals*, which was reviewed in our columns at the time of its appearance, has prepared a synopsis of the physiology of the brain in its relation to mind which is very readable and instructive to the general public. It contains an interesting collection of analyses of cases which would go far to prove that mind should not be identified with brain-action; but we have to emphasise that Dr. Christison goes a little too far in his theory of the independence of mind. He should consider that in all the cases of loss of brain-substance, one of the hemispheres only was injured. As to the brainless dog of Professor Goltz, we have to say that this famous creature did *not* "exhibit defects only in the manifestation of intelligence, memory, reflexion, and understanding," but he was a perfect idiot of a dog and showed no signs of intelligence; he was, as Professor Goltz expressed it himself, a living and eating reflex mechanism; he was a living animal, performing all the functions of animal life without any intelligence whatever. Professor Goltz's own statements are perhaps misleading and in addition it must be granted that in the course of further life he developed memory again, but even that was insignificant, and the dog continued to give the impression of a soul-dumb animal. As the reviewer has himself seen the dog, shown by Professor Goltz, he could form his own opinion on this point.

While Dr. Christison seems to believe that soul-activity is possible without the corresponding brain-commotion, we would say that much intelligence is left even after the removal of great quantities of brain-substance, if only some parts of the brain-substance able to perform the work are left. Nature apparently has been